

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 ROMULO HIDALDO FLORES,) Case No. EDCV11-0840-CJC (DTB)
12 Petitioner,)
13 vs.) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
14 IMMIGRATION AND)
15 NATURALIZATION SERVICE,)
16 HOMELAND SECURITY,)
17 Respondent.)

18 On July 18, 2011, in response to the Court's Order Requiring Response to
19 Petition, respondent filed their Response to Petition. Petitioner failed to file an
20 Opposition to respondents' Response and on September 15, 2011, served petitioner
21 with a Minute Order, *sua sponte*, extending petitioner's time up to and including
22 October 7, 2011, to file any Opposition. On September 20, 2011, the Court received
23 its Minute Order returned from the institution marked as "Return to Sender Inmate
24 No Longer at CIM." On September 22, 2011, the Court issued another Minute Order
25 which noted that the annotation on the envelope returned to the Court indicated that
26 petitioner was no longer housed at Chino State Prison. The Court further noted that
27 as petitioner was previously advised, pursuant to Central District of California Local
28 Rule 41-6, petitioner was to immediately notify the Court and counsel for respondents
of any change of petitioner's address. Petitioner was advised that if he failed to keep

1 the Court informed of his current address, the action may be subject to dismissal for
2 failure to prosecute. (See Order Requiring Response to Petition ¶ 10.) Petitioner
3 was ordered to provide the Court with his current address with 15 days of the date of
4 the Minute Order and his failure to do so would warrant the Court's dismissal of the
5 action with or without prejudice for want of prosecution. On October 5, 2011, the
6 Court received its September 22, 2011, Minute Order returned from the institution
7 again marked as "Return to Sender Inmate No Longer at CIM."

8 Petitioner thus has failed to timely provide the Court with his current address.

9 Accordingly, on or before **November 28, 2011**, petitioner is ORDERED to
10 either (a) show good cause in writing, if any exists, why petitioner did not timely
11 provide the Court with his current address, and why the Court should not recommend
12 that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the
13 Court's prior Order; or (b) serve and file a Notice of Change of Address. Petitioner
14 is forewarned that, if he fails to do either, the Court may deem such failure a further
15 violation of a Court order justifying dismissal, and also deem such failure as further
16 evidence of a lack of prosecution on petitioner's part.

17
18 DATED: November 1, 2011



21
22 DAVID T. BRISTOW
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28